

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-53 are currently pending. Claims 1-3, 10-15, 18-21, 23-25, 32-37, 40, 43, and 45-53 have been amended by the present amendment. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12-15, 23-26, 31, 32, 34-37, 45, 46, 48, and 50-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,694 to Lazaridas et al. (hereinafter “the ‘694 patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,136 to Kuwabara (hereinafter “the ‘136 patent”); Claims 5-7, 11, 16, 17, 27-29, 30, 33, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘694 and ‘136 patents, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,951,636 to Zerber (hereinafter “the ‘636 patent”); Claim 47 was rejected under 37 C.F.R. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘694 and ‘136 patents in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,492 to Miyachi (hereinafter “the ‘492 patent”); Claims 18 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘136 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,522,421 to Chapman et al. (hereinafter the “‘421 patent”); Claims 19-22 and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘136 and ‘421 patents in view of the ‘694 patent; and Claims 49 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘136 and ‘421 patents in view of the ‘492 patent.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method of processing messages, comprising:

(1) receiving an electronic mail message by a computer; (2) determining whether a content of the received message is for a user or relates to monitoring or control of an attached image printing device associated with the computer by detecting a characteristic of the message, the attached image printing device including a processor; (3) transmitting a communication from

the computer to the attached printing device, if the determining step determines that the received message is for the image printing device; and (4) operating the processor of the attached image printing device in response to the communication.

The '694 patent is directed to a system and method for pushing information from a host system to a mobile communication device having a shared electronic address with the host system. As shown in Figure 1, the '694 patent discloses a system in which certain user-defined event triggers are activated and messages or commands are redirected from a desktop computer to a mobile communications device. In particular, as shown in Figure 4, regarding incoming email messages, if the messages are to be redirected by the redirector 12, the message is repackaged by placing an outer wrapper around the original message before sending to the mobile device.<sup>1</sup> However, as admitted in the Office Action, the '694 patent fails to disclose determining whether a content of the received message is for a user or relates to monitoring or control of an attached device associated with the computer, and transmitting a communication from the computer to the attached device if the determining step determines that the received message is for the attached device, as recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the '694 patent fails to disclose an image printing device, as recited in amended Claim 1.

The '136 patent is directed to a system for the remote diagnosis of device "troubles" including a trouble diagnosing computer capable of diagnosing troubles which occur in a main part of a device associated with a user. As shown in Figure 1, computers 5, 6 and 7 are connected via the Internet to a provider computer 8 which is connected to a trouble diagnosis computer 4. As shown in Figure 5, a mail setting program saves diagnostic data, which is sent to the provider computer 5 in an email. Further, the '136 patent discloses that, based on the addressee email code in the email, the provider 5 determines whether the email is

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., the '694 patent, column 10, line 39 - column 11, line 5.

addressed to the maker's provider computer 8, and transmits the email message to the provider 8 if it is addressed to the provider 8. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '136 patent fails to disclose determining whether content of a received message is for a user or relates to monitoring or control of an attached image printing device associated with the computer by detecting a characteristic of the message, as recited in amended Claim 1. The provider computer 8 is not an attached image printing device. Further, the '136 patent fails to disclose transmitting a communication from the computer to the attached image printing device when the determining step determines that the received message is for the image printing device, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Thus, no matter how the teachings of the '694 and '136 patents are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest the determining and transmitting steps recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 23 recites limitations analogous to the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. Moreover, Claim 23 has been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 23 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 23.

Regarding the rejection of dependent Claims 5-7, 11, 16, 17, 27-29, 30, 33, 38, 39, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicants respectfully submit that the '636 and '492 patents fail to remedy the deficiencies of the '694 and '136 patents, as discussed above. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of the above-identified dependent claims are rendered moot by the present amendment to independent Claims 1 and 23.

Amended Claim 18 is directed to a method of transmitting, comprising: (1) transmitting state information including at least one of static, semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device from the image printing device to a first computer directly attached to the image printing device, the image printing device including a processor; (2) processing the state information by a software component within the first computer; and (3) transmitting, by the first computer, the processed state information over the Internet to a monitoring second computer. The changes to Claim 18 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.<sup>2</sup>

As discussed above, the '136 patent is directed to a system for carrying out remote diagnosis between a maker and its users wherein each user has a device controlled by its control computer and the maker has a trouble-diagnosing computer capable of diagnosing troubles which occur in each device. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '136 patent fails to disclose transmitting state information including at least one of static, semistatic, and dynamic states of an image printing device from the image printing device to a first computer directly attached to the image printing device, as recited in amended Claim 18. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the '136 patent fails to disclose transmitting, by the first computer, the process device state information over the Internet to a monitoring second computer. The '136 patent fails to disclose an image printing device or a monitoring second computer, as recited in amended Claim 18.

The '421 patent is directed to a method and apparatus for automatically communicating returning status information from a printer using electronic mail. The '421 patent discloses that an email message is sent from the printer relative to the status of a document reproduction job being performed on the printer.<sup>3</sup> However, Applicants

---

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Figures 9 and 10 and the discussion related thereto in the specification.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Abstract of the '421 patent.

respectfully submit that the '421 patent fails to disclose transmitting state information including at least one of static, semistatic, and dynamic states of an image printing device from the image printing device directly attached to the image printing device and transmitting, by the first computer, the processed state information over the Internet to a monitoring second computer.

Thus, no matter how the teachings of the '136 and '421 patents are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest transmitting, by the first computer, processed state information (including at least one of static, semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device) over the Internet to a monitoring second computer, as recited in amended Claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 18 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 18.

Claim 40 recites limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 18. Moreover, Claim 40 has been amended in manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 18. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 40 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 40.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 19-22, 41-44, 49, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the '694 and '492 patents fail to remedy the deficiencies of the '136 and '421 patents, as discussed above. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claims 18 and 40, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of the above-listed dependent claims are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claims 18 and 40.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 18, 23, and 40 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '694, '136, '492, '636, and '421 patents.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kurt M. Berger

James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648  
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 51,461

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\KMB\5244\5244-0084\52440084-AF.DOC